



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,219	12/19/2000	Adam Bosworth	41016.P004	7676

25943 7590 03/13/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

VU, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/741,219

Applicant(s)

BOSWORTH ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A. Vu

Art Unit

2193

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As for the arguments that DTD does not specify any data processing operations. The claim is interpreted in 2 parts; first: data processing specifications having unnested cell specification; second: each of which specification having a plurality of statements including a formula or a action/computation. DTD by Bex is example of data processing specification, because the subsequent work dealing with a DTD cell/field includes processing; and DTD cell/field each represent a specification enabling the ensuing parsing/processing to execute some code; in short the data of a DTD are data processing specification. They are unnested because of the example on stand-alone tag that do not nest another tag in layout of a DTD; or stand alone cell in the parsing tree resulting from the DTD. Thus, the specification (for processing) being in form of unnested cells is disclosed. Next, each cell when being processed by the parsing engine in BEX's transformation involves a node or a leaf of a parsing tree, and in doing this (to create a XSLT based transformation), each of these node of the DOM/XPath tree engenders underlying code or script/interface exemplified via the Query APIs. Hence, the limitation recited as 'having a plurality of statements ... formula specifying ... computation' is fulfilled. See rejection. There is no explicit teaching from the claim that compels that a DTD field (because they do not directly exhibit a programming construct) will not read on 'processing cell specification'. As interpreted, processing the cell is done by the parsing process; and each cell in the DTD is integral to such process wherein each time a node of the parse tree is resolved, some API is to be invoked; and that API construct or query commands read on 'having ... statements ... formula ... computation'.. The lack of specificity in the claim has led to other interpretation and the arguments against Bex DTD are non-persuasive. The other arguments against this DTD revolve on a narrow connotation that the DTD is lacking formula inside each of its tags; but the claim as recited does not enforce the existence of any document or any structuring inside such to reasonably rebut why a DTD is not teaching 'processing cell specification' ;when in fact each time a cell in the DTD is analyzed, the implication is that a API or commands is invoked according to a defined hierarchy (from processing a query founded on the requirments stemming from those cells). The claims stand rejected because they do not clearly establish a clear novel in sufficient terms to put the invention in form for allowance..


KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100